

AGENDA
Alaska TRCC Meeting

April 15, 2009

AST Conference Room, 5700 Tudor Rd.

1:30 pm – 4:30 pm

Tele conf # 1-800-315-6338, meet me code 5682

Attendees:

- Ron Martindale, DOT&PF
- Kim Carpenter, MOA
- John Glick, AST
- Kat Peterson, AST
- Diane Schenker, Courts
- Cindy Cashen, AHSO, DOT&PF
- Carl Gonder, DOT&PF
- Hans Brinke, AST
- Kerry Hennings, DMV
- Kathy Budke, AHSO, DOT&PF
- Ulf Petersen, CVE, DOT&PF
- David Brower, DOL
- John Lucking, Soldotna PD, AACOP
- Tony Piper, ASAP, DHSS, DBH
- Joanna Bradford, AHSO, DOT&PF

On the phone:

- Greg Browning, Juneau PD, AACOP
- Shirley Wise, NHTSA
- Greg Frederickson, NHTSA
- Alice Rarig, DHSS
- Jill Sullivan, DOT&PF

The meeting commences at 1:35 pm

I. Internal Committee Business

- a.** Approval of meeting notes from March 25 meeting
 - ***Cindy motions for approval of the March 25, 2009 meeting minutes
 - ***Ron seconds the motion
 - ***All in favor, no opposed, motion carries. The meeting minutes stand

- b.** Other?
 - None

II. Updates on Action Items from Previous Meetings

a. Tony Piper's paperwork

Action item completed. Tony is now a voting member of the ATRCC.

b. Tim Bundy's paperwork

Tim has the paperwork, and is working on collecting the necessary signatures

c. Doodle Calendar for FFY10 Project Review meeting

i. Tuesday April 28th

- David is not available, but could possibly attend via teleconference
- Hans – This is a Project Review and grading, but possibly also the strategic plan if we have time

ii. What time?

- All agree to start at 9am and end when the committee is finished

iii. In person, or via teleconference?

- Both

iv. Reserve the AST Conference Room?

- Use the AST conference room, with teleconference for those not able to travel

*****The FFY10 Project Review meeting to review and grade the submitted 408 grant proposals will occur on Tuesday, April 28th, in the AST Conference room, starting at 9:00 am and ending when the Committee is finished. If there is time at this meeting, the FFY10 Strategic Plan may also be addressed. Teleconference will be available.**

III. Other Short Business

a. Chief Lucking's Presentation

- Table this to another meeting

b. Other?

- None

IV. Solicited Traffic Records Projects for FFY2010, 408 funding

a. Alaska Crash Outcomes – Alice Rarig

- Alice - We are underway with the project. We had an advisory group meeting that was very productive. I spoke with Marcia Howell and Ron Perkins, and talked about the software that they used previously. The advisory group decided that we will start with a fresh copy of this software rather than an older version. We are moving forward on getting a copy of this.
- We expect in this year to link the data (Trauma registry, crash data, and hospital data). I have some comparison data to make sure we are doing it correctly. We will work with the advisory committee and other agencies to find the best ways to do this, while

protecting personally identifying info. We will do a good summary report to show the state. We will also be putting in snowmachine, boating, and air. So we have an overview of all crashes, injuries, in the state. We will get that done in conjunction with the trauma registry.

- Ulf – how much are you asking for in the second year
- Alice – 99.8 thousand, about the same in the second year. About two thirds salary, one third acquisition of data, web posting, and a bit for additional training on the software. I am putting in an org chart and a timeline this time.
- Carl – will this be the final year of the project?
- Alice - the final year of the pilot, but in the second year we will make sure it becomes a permanent part of the state activity. One of the deliverables will be how to do this and maintain it for future permanent use.

b. Knik-Goose Bay Road Speed Info Systems - Jill Sullivan for Jack Stickel

- Jill – this application is an extension to the 2009 grant. Installing speed sensors in the road. We will be asking for three main items. To date, no money has been spent yet on this year's grant. We will be asking for another speed sensor, so this means 4 speed sensors. This is also for maintenance and operation. We will also be requesting non-intrusive pavement sensors which will be more appropriate and less expensive.
- We would like to continue this project for up to three years. There is considerable interest in this project in order to reduce the crashes in this area.

Objective: *to reduce the unsafe speed behavior on the first 8.3 miles of the Knik-Goose Bay Road*

Benefits – the project can provide the:

- a) Alaska State Troopers and Wasilla Police Department with a tool to analyze the daily speed patterns and target on-site speed enforcement by location and time of day
- b) ADOT&PF Traffic and Safety with a tool to analyze the effectiveness of posted speed limits and to identify potential problem areas for vehicle speed, speed variation, and passing zones that lead to vehicle crashes
- c) ADOT&PF Headquarters with a prototype for traffic sensor deployment, site polling, and web services for the Glenn Highway Commuter Corridor from Anchorage to Parks Interchange.
- d) ADOT&PF with a roadmap to meet the FHWA requirements for developing a *Real-Time System Management Information Program* for the Department within the two year window for:
 - a. Construction activities affecting travel conditions such as implementing or removing land closures
 - b. Roadway or lane blocking traffic information
 - c. Updated weather observations
 - d. **Travel time along highway segments**

FY2009 Project:

- a) Potentially Install up to four traffic sensors at key locations on the Knik-Goose Bay Road where fatal and major injury accident rate is high. Exact number depends on cost.
- b) Conduct a user survey to determine the most advantageous methods to present data
- c) Deploy a polling process to collect data at a frequent interval, .i.e., less than one hour
- d) Develop web services, based on the user needs, to deliver speed information to law enforcement agencies
- e) Complete a post project analysis
- f) Status:
 - a. Start delayed to late Notice to Proceed, approval to purchase equipment, and most importantly, WINTER.
 - b. Now working on sensor deployment
 - c. Have completed initial field survey; final field survey scheduled 30 April
 - d. Working with DOT on using luminaires to install Wavetronix

FY2010 Application Additives:

- a) One additional Wavetronix Sensor non-intrusive traffic at key point
 - b) One full year of system operation – power and communication
 - c) One full year evaluation
 - d) Leverage experience to Glenn Highway Corridor
-
- Carl – I think Jack wanted to give the committee a sense of how this rule making will impact traffic safety.
 - Jill – the notice of proposed rulemaking is an aggressive plan. It means installing sensors to collect real-time data. The rule is to have this installed on all interstates within 2 years of the NPRM. We don't have "real" interstates in Alaska, though we do call them that in HAS, but they are not treated as such in the state. Jack and I just submitted comments to feds about this. So we do need to find this out first. In HAS they are labeled as an interstate, and then broken down to urban and rural interstates, and I think the feds will make us apply this to the urban interstates.
 - Carl – so you are hoping they will back off on this and only do the urban
 - Jill – in the rural areas they have standards to do it every one to three miles, and that is just not possible here
 - Carl - I want to emphasize, that a few years from now it will come down the road and will be before this committee.
 - Jill – yes possibly in a few months even

c. AACOP TraCS Project – AACOP representative

- John L. – we have an application in to continue funding and involvement. To move to the next phase of the TraCS system. To have participation of agencies throughout the state
- Greg – the chiefs association thinks this will. It is a complex project with a lot of interests to consider, but it is important long term. There are a number of deployment strategies. DPS will take care of the infrastructures. The AACOP grant is for the smaller agencies that want to deploy TraCS
- Carl – how does this proposal gel with the presentation in Juneau last week?
- Greg – this is the option that the TraCS consultants feel is the most economically feasible option. There is a meeting planned to talk about this with the contractors and DPS.
- Carl – so it is an option, but you are open to other options?
- Greg – no it is not set in stone, we are open
- Carl – not everyone is aware of the different system.
- Greg – he is referring to the open RMS (Records Management System), which uses the existing servers to capture the data, and then we work on a transfer. We want to do things quicker and for less money for the local agencies. It uses existing resources, and has the capabilities for taking in the data.
- Kat – I haven't had a chance to look at it. Is it true that most agencies have their own RMS?
- Greg – this is not meant to replace their existing RMS. It is just a way to collect the data.
- Lance – I've only had a little time to look over the proposal. But it is best to work together. There is some concern to work with the open RMS. I encourage the people in the TraCS committee to make sure it is more focused on the TraCS issues and not so much with non-TraCS things. It might not be a good choice to do open RMS when it is not a long term plan
- John L. - this is only an option. This should really be discussed in the TraCS committee.
- Greg – we have to have the funding to go forth and determine what we want
- Kat – the current grant goes against what the TraCS meeting wants, and the next meeting won't be until after these grants are reviewed
- Diane – aren't the grants flexible so things could be modified? Maybe as a project review committee, we can make a statement that we will go under the direction of the TraCS Steering committee
- Cindy - we will review and prioritize the grants to work with the AHSO and we will use the committees recommendations and suggestions for modifications of grant applications

- Carl – my perception, of the two committees, the approach that AACOP is taking belongs more as a proposal to the TRCC, as opposed to the TraCS Steering Committee. The TraCS committee is only for TraCS and not for other things. ATRCC should do this because this is for other things and not just TraCS
- Diane – but this proposal is for funding
- John L. – the funding allows us to keep going. As the program evolves we will have to morph it
- Diane – we will have to drill down the details and make recommendations, and that's what they would use the funds for
- Cindy – you are in agreement
- Greg – agrees with Diane
- Cindy – we will look at the grant applications, then we look at these and then they go to the TraCS steering committee.
- Lance – it is important for the application to be very broad and not naming particular products like open RMS
- John L. – we want to work more with DPS, and be intricately involved together.
- Kat – it looks like it is going in two different directions
- Cindy – the current DPS TraCS project is in the BHP grant, which is not in 408. I'm assuming DPS will put in a grant app?
- Kat – we will see what TraCS 10 does to decide if we will put in a grant application. We didn't put in a 408 grant application last year.
- Diane – did we have to have everything proposed for 408 funding in to the Committee today?
- Ron – yes
- Cindy – this is just at the general level right now.

d. 12-200 Crash Form Training Project – Ron Martindale, Kat Peterson

- Ron – we have a current grant in FFY09 but we started late. We are going after the written material, and do training around the state. In the year two grant, it is simply to finish what we don't get done by September 30. We're not sure how much it will need. The target is to finish by December of this year.
- Cindy – we can carry it over if we want. 408 are all traffic records grants. But we have other pots of money
- Ron – we are on our way. We will be sending out a draft to everyone in order to get comments soon. We want input soon on this. We need to provide sources for where each definition is coming from.
- David – hard copies, print?
- Ron – print for police depts., and for our training, but we'll have an electronic version of it too.

e. 12-200 Electronic Crash Data Entry Protocol – Carl Gonder

- Carl - We had a late start, due to controversy of the pilot project. It delayed the start of the project. But we just received a green light to go on this from Jeff Ottesen. We might not need all the money, because of the late start. I'll do what I can this year, and complete the rest next year. (Carl passes out handouts) Here is an overview of the original grant proposal. We won't use it all in the first year. We are requesting a rollover of some of the first year funds, and then additional second year funds. We have not spent any of the 09 funds yet. We will try to start it shortly, but will not be able to finish it, so it will go into next year. And the final year will relate to APD and integrating their data into the system. The first year puts in TraCS data, and the second year will be non-TraCS data into the system. So John Rockwell of APD will work with their data to make it compatible.
- Cindy – Jeff Ottesen gave direction to have Kat Peterson and Ron Martindale be involved in this project. To keep them apprised of the project. So if there are any questions, they are involved.
- Carl – we can do this, but it is not shown on the handouts.
- Cindy – the project team has to include Ron and Kat. It needs to be in the grant, it is important. So it dispels any conflicting ideas. To include AST and Central Region. If you are naming agencies on this project, you'll have to include AST and Central Region
- Carl – I can put them in there.
- Kat – DMV was a part of this. And this looks like it cuts them out of the loop. Are we not having to send this to them to get to you?
- Carl – I thought DMV is putting in a grant request too
- Kerry – yes, we are
- Carl – DMV will do their part separately. It will go into the server but how it gets there is your call
- Kerry – correct
- Diane – the first step is to have an interface from TraCS to the crash data, and then DMV.
- Carl – this is a pilot project to work with one agency that has TraCS and one agency that does not have TraCS. There is overlap because it takes time to make modifications to PacketWriter.
- Diane – if there is a standard to write to, and it is a TraCS document, and it is going to a central server, what is left for APD to do? Would it go faster for them? A single standard and APD is just mapping to it?
- Carl – same edit check rules and data transition rules
- Diane – xml interface?
- Carl – global justice.
- Diane – so pilot project B is just to work with APD?

- Carl – yes for them to add edit check rules.
- Diane – will they send it to you in PacketWriter, or their RMS? There is a lot between packet writer and an RMS.
- Carl - we are going to get the same edit check rules into PacketWriter that are in TraCS
- Ron – this is just a pilot, and in the mean time DMV will still get the paper copies?
- Kerry – yes
- Carl – DMV will develop their own process and then they will pass it off to anyone who wants it.
- Diane – So it is really an APD project. Why do they need anything done to their propriety system?
- Carl – we have to make sure that what they have is working on our end
- Diane – why doesn't APD have to make the effort to do the standard if that is what we are asking everyone else to do?
- Carl – the grant isn't going to APD,
- Diane – why aren't they putting in a grant proposal for this
- Carl – the approach I was taking was that we have one central project manager to get this done. I have to have the resources to work with APD. I have to work with them to make sure they develop the standards.
- Ron – it is worth it to us to give them this money. We want them to come forward.
- Diane – if we ran out, they might also have some of their own money too?
- Carl – we'll have to identify what he needs and cost it out before doing that.

f. Store and Manage Electronic Reports – Kerry Hennings

- Kerry – (passes around the project narrative.) This is an electronic storage, so we can capture and receive the electronic reports, and also run them through Insurennet. It is a one time grant to get the system in place and be able to function. We'll take it over after the year. But this is just to get it up and running. We will work closely with DPS.
- Kat – once DMV has Insurennet, all local law enforcement will be able to check it in NLETS
- John L. – lots of local law enforcement don't have access to NLETS
- Kerry – this is something the DMV has been working on for years, and Insurennet has given this to us for free. Then we'll be taking the data and sending it to DOT or whoever else needs it. Right now all the crash reports go to Carl's server.
- Diane – if they are the central repository, why are the arrows going to them?
- Carl – they will lift the data off of the server and put it on their own server, then send it to DOT in the way they need it.
- Ron – so we're not getting the data in the yellow server. The yellow box says DMV.
- Carl – it will be in HAS. It is a mid-tier server
- Kerry – if eventually the data goes to DOT it is fine.
- Carl – the concept started 5 years ago

- Diane, Cindy, - why don't we change it? Any reason to have an extra server in the mix? What is the advantage?
- Carl – if they want the whole project, they can have it
- Ron – these are not competing projects
- Carl – their proposal has just surfaced in the past month or two. We are not coordinated yet.
- Kerry – the 12-209 is one thing but if the 12-200s start coming in, we need to have the backend to accept them
- Ron – right now these are separate issues
- Kerry – we will just be working on our part of the report
- Carl – they use about 30 data elements
- Kat - by law DMV is the repository
- Diane – when a crash report is created, they are not really the repository though. Maybe this should be in law, and we should clean it up. DMV shouldn't be labeled the repository if someone else is putting in all the money
- Cindy – right now it is HAS, but that is not timely enough
- Kerry – once all the protocols are met and the transfer is complete. Right now we need to get permission to use the 12-209, and this is not good. We want control of this ourselves.
- Carl – we don't have an electronic 12-200 yet. That is what my grant is for.
- Cindy – that will mean talking with other agencies.
- Kerry – officially hands the original grant application with all the necessary signatures to Cindy

g. Others?

None

V. Last Minute Items

- The date is set for the Project Review meeting; April 28th at 9 am in the AST Conference Room.
- We will need deadline on getting all the applications out to the members
- No more "in-kind" listed on the grant applications
- Cindy – this is the amount that you can use. You can't use whatever is being funded by a federal source.
- Diane – they have to put in the percentage. So either have someone all or part and then they will have to keep track
- Kathy – they can do the different percentages, and then they provide the payroll as backup
- Diane – this is hard for some people to do.
- Kathy – and you'll have to put it on the grant saying "So-and-so will do this percentage of his time on this project"

- Cindy – if any of it is funded with highway safety we will need the payroll as backup, and show any outside funding. We are looking at blanket matches for entire funding. So some of these projects might not have match.
- Ron – so we don't put "in kind", we don't put us in at all?
- Carl – in the narrative, but not in the budget part.
- Hans – We still need a deadline
- Cindy – so Wednesday morning April 22nd is the deadline
- Hans - We will have the review on the 28th.

*****The deadline for all Grant Applications to be sent out to all members for review is April 22nd.**

VI. Action Items as a Result of this Meeting

- All Grant Applications should be sent to the AHSO, and then emailed to all the Committee members by April 22nd.
- Tim Bundy's paperwork

VII. Upcoming Dates:

- April 22nd – All Grant Applications sent to members
- April 28th - Project Review Meeting
- May 6th - the Committee will have the draft plan completed

This is to prioritize the grants and possibly the strategic plan. We will start and complete it that day. So we will have already individually reviewed and prioritized the plans. We will meet at the **AST conference room, 9am to 4pm**

- May 13th - the Committee will send the draft plan out to all members for final review, via email.
- May 20th – *Next regular Committee meeting* – the Committee will agree on the Final Prioritization

Meeting adjourns at 3:10pm